4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

national state and a world power, the need for trained personnel in the government services and in commerce became evident if only for practical considerations. Ivan the Terrible himself was comparatively well-educated, while Boris Godunov, his progressive but ill-fated minister and eventual successor, was obliged by the innate conservatism of the clergy to abandon a promising project for the establishment at Moscow of an academy with learned foreigners as teachers.

For, despite isolated outbreaks of rationalism which manifested themselves in heretical movements, the intellectual horizon of the Russian clergy was discouragingly narrow. After the Council of Florence, they considered themselves the sole repository of Orthodox rectitude and resented even competent criticism. That learned scholar from Mount Athos, Maxim Grek, who had studied in Italy and heard Savonarola preach, was accused of heresy and imprisoned when he ventured to suggest textual corrections of the accepted liturgy, and though he lived on into the reign of Ivan the Terrible, he was always regarded with suspicion and never allowed to return to his native country until his death in 1556.

Whatever material progress was registered under the Muscovite princes, the introduction of new intellectual concepts encountered serious barriers. From a social standpoint also the Muscovite regime was responsible for the establishment of one institution which cast its dark shadow over Russia far down into the nineteenth century. Though slavery was not unknown, universal agrarian serfdom does not date from the origins of Russia. On the contrary, its evolution was gradual. In the early Muscovite period there were two classes of peasants: first, those who had lived for some time on state, church, or private land and payed various fixed duties on the parcels they occupied; second, the so-called movable peasants who rented parcels on term contracts. As the princes assigned estates to deserving officials who did not belong to the old landed aristocracy, some competition developed among proprietors for peasants to till their lands, with the result that by the middle of the sixteenth

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

566 century any transfer of the so-called fixed, or black, peasants
1752 was forbidden. The movable peasants, on the other hand, enjoyed the customary privilege of changing landlords when they desired. Ivan III's legislation thus guaranteed them the right to shift within the weeks on either side of St. George's day, in the autumn of each year, though the tax they paid for the enjoyment of the privilege was relatively high.

On the other hand, the need for help was so acute that landlords might frequently pay this tax and whatever other debts a movable peasant owed in order to induce him to settle on their estates, but a peasant not thus aided could no longer move and, if the advances received from his landlord in cash or kind were considerable, he too became permanently attached to the soil unless another landlord bailed him out. With increasing frequency, since a shift of landlord was rapidly becoming impossible, the peasants bound themselves not to withdraw, but to remain in permanent service under one master, under penalty of being returned by force in case they ever broke this contract. Apart from these developments, the fact that the majority of peasants had no capital whatever also tended to reduce to effective servitude such peasants as borrowed from landlords and bound themselves to serve the lender on his estate until the loan was liquidated. In principle such a borrower could free himself by paying the debt. In practice, however, all his labor was devoted to paying the interest rather than wiping out the capital, so that he never succeeded in liberating himself. The operation of this system was legally restricted during the sixteenth century, but it was at one with the other tendencies which contributed to immobilizing and enslaving a rural population which at its origins had been unattached and free. In the sixteenth century it was still free in theory, but in the seventeenth even this theoretical freedom vanished when the master wanted the peasant's labor and the government his taxes. To indemnify the landlord for his collective responsibility for the tax payments of the peasants on his estates, the latter were literally turned into the chattels of

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

the landlord. In this way, under the early Romanovs, between 1630 and 1650, freedom of agricultural labor was abolished in Russia, and this situation prevailed until 1861.

The Muscovite system suffered a severe blow in 1598 when Theodore, Ivan the Terrible's son, died intestate and the old dynasty tracing its descent from Rurik became extinct. Since the realm and its inhabitants were regarded as the absolute property of the sovereign, the disappearance of the ruling family was a major catastrophe. Any tsar, however legitimately elected by the general assembly convoked by the patriarch of Moscow, was bound to be weakened by his dynastic illegitimacy. Hence with the reign of Boris Godunov began a period of violent revolution which lasted until 1613, largely motivated by the effort of the nobles to free themselves from exactions and restrictions which tradition forced them to endure from a scion of the old line, but which they would not suffer from anyone else.

When Michael, the first of the Romanovs, was finally elected to the throne in 1613, political self-consciousness had developed to the point where there was some realization that the sovereign actually depended on the people and not the reverse. On the other hand, this realization was strongest among the great nobles, the landowners, and the high officials, and they set up the new dynasty at the price of privileges not otherwise obtainable. It is also notable that the rudiments of parliamentary government, typified by a popular assembly, likewise existed in the early years of Michael's reign, but failed to mature because the level of popular political intelligence was not high enough to appreciate that elective representatives of the people had a real weapon in their potential control of finances. Hence there was no protest when the governing class allowed it to lapse. The government became intensely centralized, and with the establishment of serfdom the nobility and the gentry inevitably became a permanent ruling class upon which the crown was dependent. Since townsmen were forbidden to move into the country, and peasants could no longer establish them-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

selves in the cities, there was as yet no prospect for the formation of a growing and self-conscious middle class whose aspirations might have sown the seeds of progress. As a result, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries all intellectual advance was confined to the aristocratic and ruling minority.

In the seventeenth century, however, the door was again opened to Western influence by the need for self-defense. Foreign mercenaries entered the Russian army, which now became a professional force. New mines and arsenals were opened. The foreign colony founded at Moscow by Ivan the Terrible (the German suburb), though scattered during the upheaval of 1598-1612, was soon repopulated with merchants, technicians, and artisans, and their advanced notions of material comfort influenced those Russians who came into contact with them. Artamon Matveyev, the able foreign minister of Michael's son, the Tsar Alexis (in turn Peter the Great's father), married a Scotch lady, and was one of the first Russian nobles to set up his household on a Western scale. Through him notions of contemporary culture penetrated even to the court. Natalia Narishkina, Peter the Great's mother, was Matveyev's ward, and though Scotch on her mother's side, was probably the first Muscovite lady of her day to receive even a moderate education and to emancipate herself from the seclusion in which noblewomen had vegetated since the Tartar conquest.

While material progress was largely implemented by the German technicians resident in Moscow, new theological and literary ideas penetrated the empire by another route. It may be recalled that Kiev and the Dnieper valley were conquered by the Lithuanians in 1363. Then by the fusion of Poland and Lithuania at the end of the fourteenth century, the whole Ukraine became exposed to Polish colonization and cultural influence. By the sixteenth century, Polish intellectual life was entirely under the control of the Jesuits, who developed an intense but largely unsuccessful proselytizing activity among the Orthodox Ukrainians. As a counterpoise against Jesuit influence, the Orthodox clergy of the Kiev area opened schools

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

pean campaigns were inoculated with the republican ideas disseminated by the French revolution. Essentially patriotic, they were eager to apply these ideals to their own country, to abolish the autocracy, promote republican government, raise the standard of education, and do away with the abuses of serfdom They continued with greater energy, though often with little judgment, the task begun by Radishchev.

Here the Russian revolutionary movement begins among an enlightened fraction of the ruling class. Great writers like Pushkin and Lermontov, each after brief romantic digressions, grew up to treat the seamy side of reality, both in the tragedy of the humble who are scarcely considered human by those they serve, or the misfortune of the gifted individual denied a chance at productive activity by the contemporary organization of society. Both these talents were suspected and harassed by the autocracy, and though each met his death in a duel, they were as truly victims of official conservatism as those young enthusiasts who had participated in the Decembrist conspiracy in 1825 after the death of Alexander I, and paid for it on the scaffold or amid the snows of Siberia. But from 1825 the cleavage between the government and the thoughtful section of society, once opened, was never bridged again.

This mutual hostility first became acute during the reign of Nicholas I from 1825 to the Crimean War. The Decembrist conspiracy had revealed that the turn to the right by Alexander I after 1815 had created great bitterness. The same judicial and administrative abuses that marred Catherine's reign were still rampant, state finances were disordered, and the peasants were rudely exploited. Nicholas at first had some notion of reform, but his suspicion of extragovernmental initiative was such that he hesitated to take any concrete step. The most pressing problem was serfdom: the landlords were heavily in debt and short of capital to provide employment for a rapidly increasing peasant population. Peasant disorders were menacingly frequent, but only in the western Ukraine and in Poland were reforms introduced. Educational institutions were fettered and